UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/625,275	07/25/2000	Eric Hayes	05156.00003	6791

22907   7590   10/02/2002

BANNER & WITCOFF
1001 G STREET N W
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC   20001

EXAMINER
CUNNINGHAM, GREGORY F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 July 2000</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>5-10 and 13-15</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 July 2000</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications of application filed 7/25/2000.

2.   The group art unit of the examiner handling your case is currently 2672. Please be sure to

use the most current art unit number on all correspondence to help us route your case and

respond to you in a timely fashion.

3.   The disposition of the claims is as follows: claims 1-15 are pending in the application.

Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dresevic et

al., (U.S. Patent Number 6,253,374), hereafter Dresevic.

A.   Per claim 1, "A method for determining whether a font file is corrupted, said method

comprising the steps of:

comparing information associated with a font file stored in a computer system with

information associated with an uncorrupted font file; and in response to said step of comparing,

determining whether the font file stored in the computer system is corrupted" is disclosed in col.

6, lns. 1-25 at "(13)   An invalid hint can cause a poorly rendered glyph or even a system error.

The method for validating a <u>font file</u> distinguishes between invalid hints that cause a poorly rendered glyph and invalid hints that cause a system <u>error</u> . An invalid hint that affects the quality of a rendered glyph does not invalidate the font file, whereas an invalid hint that affects system robustness invalidates the font file.

(14)   In addition to checking the input parameters to the hints, the structure of the font file is checked. To check the structure of the font file, the structure is compared to the structure specified by the font specification. For example, the structure of a TrueType font file is defined by the TrueType specification. If the font file is a TrueType font file, then the font file is checked to determine whether the font file contains the minimal set of tables required by the TrueType specification. Also, the offsets in the font file are checked to determine whether any of the offsets reach beyond the end of the font file, the tables in the font file are checked to determine whether all of the tables start on 4-byte boundaries, and the table tags in the table directory are checked to determine whether the table tags are in alphabetical order. The checksums stored in the font file also can be checked to determine whether the checksums are correct. As will be apparent to those skilled in the art, additional types of structural checking can also be performed." Although comparing information associated with a font file stored in a computer system with information associated with an uncorrupted font file is not explicit, it is inherent with checking font file errors against uncorrupted file structure.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply checking font file errors against uncorrupted file structure disclosed by Dresevic because it would validate said files.

B.   Per claim 2, "The method according to claim 1, wherein the information associated with

the font file and the information associated with the uncorrupted font file is checksum data" is

disclosed, supra for claim 1, particularly at "The checksums stored in the font file also can be

checked to determine whether the checksums are correct. As will be apparent to those skilled in

the art, additional types of structural checking can also be performed."

C.   Per claim 3, "The method according to claim 1, wherein if the font file is corrupted, said

method further comprising the step of replacing at least a portion of the font file with the

uncorrupted font file" is disclosed, supra for claim 1. Although Dresevic does not seem to

disclose "wherein if the font file is corrupted, said method further comprising the step of

replacing at least a portion of the font file with the uncorrupted font file" Official Notice is taken

that the art is replete with downloading file via file transfer protocol (FTP) that employs error

correcting software that automatically retransmits that portion of the transmitted file deemed

corrupted.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to apply corruption detection disclosed by Dresevic in combination with

FTP error correction disclosed by Official Notice, and motivated to combine the teachings

because it would auto-correct any errors.

D.   Per claim 4, "The method according to claim 3, wherein said step of replacing further

includes the steps of:

        transmitting the ... in the computer system" is disclosed, supra for claim 3.

E.   Per claim 12, "The method according to claim 1, further comprising the ... are performed

in the computer system" is disclosed, supra for claim 3. Wherein comparisons are performed in

the computer system and the Officially Noted retransmitted is communicated via handshaking
signals.

Allowable Subject Matter

6.   Claims 5-11, and 13-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,
but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the
base claim and any intervening claims.

Responses

7.   Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,
Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires to fax a response, (703) 308-9051 may be used for
formal communications or (703) 308-6606 for informal or draft communications.

        Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. Hand-
delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.,
Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Inquiries

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Greg Cunningham whose telephone number is (703) 308-6109.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Mike Razavi, can be reached on (703) 305-4713.

        Any response to this action should be mailed to:

                        Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone

number is (703) 306-0377.

J. F. Cummings

gfc

September 25, 2002

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600